

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/539,891	06/17/2005	Johnathan A Napier	13478-00001-US	7537
23416 CONNOLLY I	7590 09/21/200 BOVE LODGE & HUT	EXAMINER		
P O BOX 2207			ZHENG, LI	
WILMINGTO	N, DE 19899		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1638	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/21/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/539,891	NAPIER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
LI ZHENG	1638	
	10/539,891 Examiner	10/539,891 NAPIER ET AL.  Examiner Art Unit

	LI ZHENG	1638					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 18 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
<ol> <li>N The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date							
<ul> <li>The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire it</li> </ul>	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
	" "th 07 OFD 44 07	Fig. 4 Marker &					
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t</li> </ol>			cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor		E below);					
<ul> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> </ul>		lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE:	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mnliant Amendment (	PTOL-324)				
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant / tinonamont (	TOL OLT,				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)</li> </ol>	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ wil	be entered and an e	xplanation of				
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 1.2.7-9 and 26. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu							
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	•		•				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13. 🔲 Other:							
/Anne Marie Grunberg/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1638							

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claims 1:2, 7-9 and 26 remain rejected under 35 U.S. C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method for accumulate C16, C18 and C20 polyunsaturated fatty acids in transgenic plant expressing nucleotide sequences encoding SEQ ID NO: 2.4 and 6, does not reasonably provide enablement for a transgenic plant to produce any compound shown in formula I of claim 1 with a control of at least 19, by weight. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it perfains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims, for the reasons of record stated in the Office action malary place (april 28, 2009, Applicants traverse in the paper filed August 18, 2009, Applicants' arguments have been fully considered but were not found persuasive.

Applicants argue the current amendment narrows the scope encompassed by the formula I of claim resonuse, case 6, last

Applicants argue the current amendment narrows the scope encompassed by the formula I of claim 1 (response, page 6, last paragraph).

The Office contends that the working example in the specification only shows the data for the content of C16, C18 and C20 polyunsaturated fatty acids such as the ones listed in table 1, it still does not provide any evidence that other compounds in the formula I of claim 1 are produced by the instant method. There is still no evidence that the transgenically expressed enzymes would produce such unmanageable number of compounds as depicted in claim 1.